UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,926	11/30/2001	Shawn P. Delany	OBLX-01028US0	4296

51206 7590 02/27/2006

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
JEAN GILLES, JUDE	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2143	

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/998,926	DELANY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jude J. Jean-Gilles	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 November 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *15-28,35-39 and 44-47* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *15-28,35-39 and 44-47* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 November 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Action is in regards to the Reply received on 11/23/2005. Claimed priority is granted from Provisional application 60258087 with a priority date of 12/22/2000.

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on 11/23/2005. Claims 15-18, 26, 27, 35, and 44 were amended. Claims 1-14, 29-34, and 40-43 are canceled. Claims 15-28, 35-39, and 44-47 are pending in this application and represent a method and system for an "group membership"

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15-28, 35-39, and 44-47 have been carefully considered, but are not deemed fully persuasive. Applicant's arguments are deemed moot in view of the following new ground of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by Applicant substantial amendment (i.e., a method wherein a first group based on a rule that defines dynamic membership for said first group, wherein said rule is stored in a dynamic rule attribute of an identity profile of said first group) to the claims which significantly affected the scope thereof.

The dependent claims stand rejected as articulated in the First Office Action and all objections not addressed in Applicant's response are herein reiterated.

Provisional Obviousness-type Rejection

2. The provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection on the first Office Action has been removed because applicant has amended/cancelled conflicting claims .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 15-28, 35-39, and 44-47** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes (Hayes), Patent No. 6,105,066 in view of Chen et al (Chen), U.S. Patent No. 65,831,975.

Regarding **claim 15**, Hayes discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Although Hayes teaches a method for identifying members of a group, comprising the steps of:

determining dynamic members of a first group ;

storing an identification of each of said dynamic members of said first group (column 20, lines 16-51; column lines 36-67; fig. 22, and 23);

receiving a request to report members of said first group, said request is received subsequent to said step of storing (column 20, lines 16-51; column lines 36-67; fig. 22, and 23); and

reporting said dynamic members of said first group in response to said request, said reporting of said dynamic members is performed based on said stored identification of said dynamic members (column 20, lines 16-51; column 8, lines 32-55; fig. 19, items 22 and 23). However, Hayes does not teach "based on a rule that defines dynamic membership for said first group, wherein said rule is stored in a dynamic rule attribute of an identity profile of said first group".

In the same field on enceavor Chen discloses "... *The method supports dynamic membership to a multicast group, in that, nodes can join or leave the multicast group during the course of the multicast. Multiple senders to the multicast group are also supported, which enables realization of a true multipoint-to-multipoint connection. In addition, the multicast tree can be dynamically changed to reflect changes in the node and link states. The invention also has very low latency, that is, the join time of a new node is significantly small...* [see Chen; column 7, lines 55-63].

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Chen's teachings of a method and system for a dynamic membership for a group based on a rule definition with the teachings of Hayes, for the purpose of providing means to develop a highly callable cheme of multicasting in a hierarchical framework which is also efficient with respect to a combination of factors like bandwidth consumption and delay... as stated by Chen in lines 44-49 of column 6. By this rationale **claim 15** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 16**, the combination Hayes-Chen discloses a method according to claim 15, wherein: said first group includes one or more static members; an identification of each of said static members is stored in a static member attribute for

said identity profile of said first group; and said identification of each of said dynamic members is stored in said static member attribute for said identity profile of said first group (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; column 8, lines 32-55; fig. 19, items 22 and 23).

Regarding **claim 17**, The combination Hayes-Chen discloses a method according to claim 15, wherein: said first group includes one or more static members; an identification of each of said static members is stored in a static member attribute for an identity profile of said first group; said identity profile of said first group also includes an expansion attribute; and said method can only be performed if said expansion attribute includes an appropriate value (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; column 8, lines 32-55).

Regarding **claim 18**, The combination Hayes-Chen discloses a method according to claim 17, wherein: said method can only be performed for an entity having access to said expansion attribute and said dynamic rule attribute (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; column 8, lines 32-55; fig. 19, items 22 and 23).

Regarding **claim 19**, The combination Hayes-Chen discloses a method according to claim 15, wherein: said steps of determining and storing are automatically repeated (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; column 18, lines 36-67).

Regarding **claim 20**, The combination Hayes-Chen discloses a method according to claim 15, wherein: said steps of determining, storing and receiving are performed by an integrated identity and access system (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; column 8, lines 32-55).

Regarding **claim 21**, The combination Hayes-Chen a method according to claim 20, wherein: said integrated identity and access system is capable of performing authorization services based on membership in said first group (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; column 8, lines 32-55; column 6, lines 21-67).

Regarding **claim 22**, The combination Hayes-Chen a method according to claim 15, further comprising the steps of: determining nested members of said first group; and storing an identification of each of said nested members of said first group, said step of reporting includes reporting said nested members based on said stored identification of said nested members (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; column 8, lines 32-55; column 6, lines 21-67).

Regarding **claim 23**, The combination Hayes-Chen a method according to claim 22, wherein: said nested members include members of multiple levels of nested groups (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; column 8, lines 32-55; column 6, lines 21-67).

Regarding **claim 24**, The combination Hayes-Chen a method according to claim 22, wherein: said step of determining nested members includes recursively determining members of group members (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; fig. 22 and 23; column 17, lines 36-48; column 8, lines 1-31).

Regarding **claim 25**, The combination Hayes-Chen a method according to claim 22, wherein: said first group includes one or more static members; and said step of reporting includes reporting said static members (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; fig. 22 and 23; column 17, lines 36-48; column 8, lines 1-31).

Regarding **claim 26**, The combination Hayes-Chen a method according to claim 15, wherein said step of determining nested members includes the steps of: determining all static group members of said first group; determining all static and dynamic members of said static group members of said first group (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; fig. 22 and 23; column 17, lines 36-48; column 8, lines 1-31); determining all static group members of said static group members of said first group; and determining all members of said static group members of said static group members of said first group (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; fig. 22 and 23; column 17, lines 36-48; column 8, lines 1-31).

Regarding **claim 27**, The combination Hayes-Chen a method according to claim 22, wherein: said first group and nested groups of said first group include rules defining criteria for being dynamic members; and said step of determining dynamic members includes the steps of determining a normalized set of said rules and determining which users are defined by said normalized set of said rules, said users defined by said normalized set of said rules are said dynamic members of said first group (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; fig. 22 and 23; column 17, lines 36-48; column 8, lines 1-31)..

Regarding **claim 28**, The combination Hayes-Chen a method according to claim 15, wherein: said first group includes one or more static members; and said step of reporting includes reporting said static members (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; fig. 22 and 23; column 17, lines 36-48; column 8, lines 1-31).

Regarding **claim 35**, The combination Hayes-Chen one or more processor readable storage devices having processor readable code embodied on said processor

readable storage devices, said processor readable code for programming one or more processors to perform a method comprising the steps of:

determining dynamic members of a first group based on a rule that defines dynamic membership for said first group, wherein said rule is stored in a dynamic rule attribute of an identity profile of said first group [see Chen; column 7, lines 55-63];

storing an identification of each of said dynamic members of said first group; and receiving a request to report members of said first group, said request is received subsequent to said step of storing (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; fig. 22 and 23; column 17, lines 36-48; column 8, lines 1-31); and reporting said dynamic members of said first group in response to said request, said reporting of said dynamic members is performed based on said stored identification of said dynamic members(see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; fig. 22 and 23; column 17, lines 36-48; column 8, lines 1-31).

Regarding **claim 36**, The combination Hayes-Chen one or more processor readable storage devices according to claim 35, wherein: said first group includes one or more static members; and said step of reporting includes reporting said static members (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; fig. 22 and 23; column 17, lines 36-48; column 8, lines 1-31).

Regarding **claim 37**, The combination Hayes-Chen one or more processor readable storage devices according to claim 36, wherein: said steps of determining and storing are automatically repeated (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; column 18, lines 36-67).

Regarding **claim 38**, The combination Hayes-Chen one or more processor readable storage devices according to claim 36, wherein: said steps of determining, storing and receiving are performed by an integrated identity and access system (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; column 8, lines 32-55).

Regarding **claim 39**, The combination Hayes-Chen one or more processor readable storage devices according to claim 36, wherein said method further comprises the steps of: determining nested members of said first group, said nested members include members of multiple levels of nested groups (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; fig. 22 and 23; column 17, lines 36-48; column 8, lines 1-31); and storing an identification of each of said nested members of said first group, said step of reporting includes reporting said nested members based on said stored identification of said nested members (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; fig. 22 and 23; column 17, lines 36-48; column 8, lines 1-31).

Regarding **claim 44**, The combination Hayes-Chen an apparatus that can determine members of a group, comprising:

a communication interface; and one or more processors in communication with said communication interface, said one or more processors perform a method comprising the steps of:

determining dynamic members of a first group based on a rule that defines dynamic membership for said first group, wherein said rule is stored in a dynamic rule attribute of an identity profile of said first group, said first group includes one or more static members [see Chen; column 7, lines 55-67];

storing an identification of each of said dynamic members of said first group, and

receiving a request to report members of said first group, said request is received subsequent to said step of storing, and reporting said static members and said dynamic members of said first group in response to said request, said reporting of said dynamic members is performed based on said stored identification of said dynamic members (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; fig. 22 and 23; column 17, lines 36-48; column 8, lines 1-31; fig. 2).

Regarding **claim 45**, The combination Hayes-Chen an apparatus according to claim 44, wherein: said steps of determining and storing are automatically repeated (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; fig. 22 and 23; column 17, lines 36-48; column 8, lines 1-31).

Regarding **claim 46**, The combination Hayes-Chen an apparatus according to claim 44, wherein: said steps of determining, storing and receiving are performed by an integrated identity and access system (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; fig. 22 and 23; column 17, lines 36-48; column 8, lines 1-31).

Regarding **claim 47**, The combination Hayes-Chen an apparatus according to claim 44, wherein said method further comprises the steps of: determining nested members of said first group, said nested members include members of multiple levels of nested groups; and storing an identification of each of said nested members of said first group, said step of reporting includes reporting said nested members based on said stored identification of said nested members (see Hayes; column 20, lines 16-51; fig. 22 and 23; column 17, lines 36-48; column 8, lines 1-31).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's Request for Reconsideration filed on 11/23/2005 has been carefully considered but is not deemed fully persuasive. However, because there exists the likelihood of future presentation of this argument, the Examiner thinks that it is prudent to address Applicants' main points of contention.

The Hayes does not disclose determining dynamic members of a group based on a rule that defines dynamic membership for that group, wherein the rule is stored in a dynamic rue attribute of an identity profile of the poup. Rather, the memberships of Hayes are all static, i.e., explicitly defined by the administrator rather than determined based on a rule. Hayes does disclose a blanket policy of requiring all users to be members of the "All users" group. However, such a blanket policy is no different than any other explicit definition of a user's group memberships. That is, this policy defines a static rather than a dynamic membership and calmot be reasonably interpreted as disclosing determining dynamic members of a group based on a rule that defines dynamic membership for that group. Furthermore, Hayes does not disclose such a rule being stored in a dynamic rule attribute of an identity profile of the group.

It is the position of the Examiner that the Hayes in detail teaches the limitations of the above mentioned claims. However, in view of Applicant's remarks above, Applicant's arguments are deemed moot in view of the following

new grounds of rejection using the new reference of Chen [*see the rejection of claim 15 above;* column 7, lines 55-67].

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Jude Jean-Gilles whose telephone number is (571) 272-3914. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley, can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-9000.

Jude Jean-Gilles

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2143

JJG

February 14, 2006

WILLIAM C. VAUGHN, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER